APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/607,374	06/30/2000	Anthony Chavez	205242	8223

23460 7590 04/19/2005		

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER
BASOM, BLAINE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action *Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief*	Application No. 09/607,374	Applicant(s) CHAVEZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Blaine Basom	Art Unit 2173	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>28 March 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE:

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

      Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____ . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

      NOTE: _____ . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____ .

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____ .

   Claim(s) objected to: _____ .

   Claim(s) rejected: _____ .

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____ .

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ .

13. ☐ Other: _____ .

JOHN CABECA
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner respectfully maintains that Hickman (U.S. Patent No. 5,361,361 to Hickman et al.) teaches mapping help topics from different vendors into a unified taxonomy structure, wherein a first level of categories is predefined, and that Habib (U.S. Patent No. 8,825,356 to Habib et al.) teaches an authorization store like described in the claimed invention. In arguing the former limitation, the Applicants submit that Hickman does does not disclose that various topics and subtopics are fit into a "predefined taxonomy structure;" the Applicants argue that, since the taxonomy structure of Hickman is determined by the various applications present, which is a dynamic characteristic, the taxonomy structure is not possibly predefined. In response, the Examiner respectfully notes that the claimed invention does not recite a "predefined taxonomy structure," but instead expresses a "unified taxonomy structure," wherein the only entity that is explicitly predefined is a single first level of categories. Moreover the Applicants, in their arguments, appear to presuppose a particular, narrow, meaning to the idea of "being predefined;" one which is not explicitly expressed in the claim, and which is associated with a static taxonomy, which doesn't change if applications are added or removed. The Examiner, however, respectfully asserts that being static is not necessarily an intrinsic attribute of "being predefined." Rather, predefined categories may, in the broadest and most reasonable sense, merely mean that one or more categories, i.e. a "first level," are defined before some point-in-time, such as before the particular instance of the unified taxonomy structure, of which they are part, is generated. Hickman teaches such categories. As described in the previous Office Action, the categories within the unified taxonomy of Hickman are defined by their associated applications, and are thus defined before the particular intstance of the unified taxonomy structure having these categories is generated. The categories of the unified taxonomy strucure, including the first level of categories, are therefore considered to be predefined. Regarding dependent claims 42, 43, 52, and 53, the Applicants argue that it is not necessary that the help contents of Habib only know the names of scripts that it is authorized to access, and that therefore, an "authorization store," comprising information for identifying which help contents are authorized to access the scripts, is not inherent in the teachings of Habib. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As described in the previous Office Action, Habib teaches presenting various categories and topics of help information to a user. Habib discloses that a "do-it-all" button may be selected for each topic, in order to execute one or more scripts which automatically complete a task regarding the particular help topic, as described in the previous Office Action. Such scripts are understood to be mapped to the particular topic; when the do-it-all button is selected, not every script mainained by the computer is executed, rather, only one or more select scripts are programmed, for example by a function call, to be executed. In other words, the program implementing the help function described by Habib, necessarily comprises information regarding which scripts are associated with which help topics, so that when the do-it-all button for a help topic is selected, the appropriate scripts are executed. The program is thus considered to comprise an "authorization store" like recited in the claimed invention. If this wasn't the case, scripts which would have no relevance to the selected help topic could be executed when the do-it-all button is selected. The Applicants assert that it is not necessary that the help content of Habib only know the names of scripts that it is authorized to access. The Examiner, however, respectfully sees no reason why a help topic of Habib would have any knowledge of scripts that it is not authorized, by a programmer, to access.